

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 CARLOS CORTEZ DOMINGUEZ,

11 Petitioner,

No. 2:12-cv-1391 DAD P

12 vs.

13 UNKNOWN,

14 Respondent.

ORDER

15 \_\_\_\_\_/  
16 Petitioner, a Missouri prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed an application for a  
17 writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254, together with a request to proceed in forma  
18 pauperis. This court will not rule on petitioner's request to proceed in forma pauperis.

19 Petitioner is presently incarcerated at Tallahatchie County Correctional Facility in  
20 Tutwiler, Missouri. He is serving a sentence on a judgment of conviction rendered by the Orange  
21 County Superior Court.

22 The general rule with regard to habeas applications is that both the United States  
23 District Court in the district where petitioner was convicted and the District Court where  
24 petitioner is incarcerated have jurisdiction over the claims. See Braden v. 30th Judicial Circuit  
25 Court, 410 U.S. 484 (1973). In the instant case, petitioner's conviction occurred in an area

26 /////

1 covered by the United States District Court for the Central District of California. Accordingly, in  
2 the furtherance of justice, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

3 1. This court has not ruled on petitioner's request to proceed in forma pauperis;

4 2. This matter is transferred to the United States District Court for the Central  
5 District of California. Id. at 499 n.15; 28 U.S.C. § 2241(d).

6 DATED: June 12, 2012.

7  
8   
9 DALE A. DROZD  
10 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

11 DAD:mp  
12 domi1391.108a  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26